

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 22, 2004, Applicants submit the following remarks. Claims 1-21 were pending. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 13-19, and 20-21 have been amended. Claims 22-34 have been added. Claims 1-34 are now pending, of which claims 1, 10, 16, 17, 20, and 21 are independent. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the action mailed January 22, 2004, is requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett et al, "Intermediaries: new places for producing and manipulating Web content" ("Barrett"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Section 103(a) Rejections

Claim 1 is directed to a method for modifying a markup language document that includes modifying at least one link within a script portion of the markup language document to link to an intermediary server. Barrett provides an article describing the general use of intermediaries in a web environment. Barrett does not disclose or suggest modifying a link within a script portion of a document to link to an intermediary server. The Examiner contends that Barrett discloses the recited modifying step of claim 1 on page 510, column 1, lines 22-45; page 512, column 1, lines 42-44; Figure 1; Figure 5B; and Table 1. Applicants disagree.

On page 510, Barrett describes various applications that can be used in conjunction with an intermediary based web programming model. Specifically, in column 1, lines 42-44, Barrett describes personalization of a user's web browsing experience using intermediaries. As an example, Barrett states that web pages can be "annotated with user notes or customized links." See Barrett page 510, column 1, lines 32-33. Although Barrett discloses that personalized links can be added to a web page, Barrett does not disclose or suggest modifying existing links within a script portion of a document to link to an intermediary server.

On page 512, column 1, lines 42-44 Barrett describes the building blocks used to construct intermediary applications within the Web Browser Intelligence (WBI) intermediary architecture. These building blocks include monitors, editors, and generators. The cited section does not mention or suggest links or how links may be modified. Similarly, Figure 1 of Barrett

illustrates the flow of a request from a browser to a caching intermediary and back to the browser. The caption of Figure 1 states that a document is personalized, but does not disclose or suggest a process for modifying a link contained within a script portion of a markup language document as claimed. In Figure 5, (there is no Figure 5B) a block diagram of a specific WBI plug-in architecture for improved wireless Web browsing is illustrated. The architecture includes a specific arrangement of the WBI building blocks, particularly a pair of Generators for converting the HTTP protocol to a compressed protocol for wireless transmission. Figure 5 does not disclose or suggest links or the modification of links as claimed.

Finally, Table 1 of Barrett lists the different WBI building blocks introduced on page 512 along with a brief description of various properties for each such as the input, output, and action for each building block. The only mention of links in the table is with respect to the Document Editor building block, in which an example action provided is to "highlight links." Again, Table 1 does not disclose or suggest modifying links to link to an intermediary server as claimed.

Because Barrett does not disclose or suggest modifying links within a script portion of a document to link to an intermediary server, Applicants submit that claim 1, as well as claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least these reasons.

Additionally, dependent claim 4 also stands rejected as unpatentable over Barrett. Claim 4, as amended, is directed to a method for modifying a link within a script portion of a markup language document that includes scanning the markup language document to locate the script portion. Barrett does not disclose or suggest scanning a markup language document to locate a script portion.

The Examiner contends that page 512, column 1, lines 17-30 discloses the recited element of claim 4. Applicants disagree. The cited section of Barrett on page 512 describes WBI as a programmable proxy server, the overall goal of WBI, and the fact that WBI has been used by more than 20 programmers. There is no disclosure or suggestion of scanning a markup language document for a script portion. Because Barrett does not disclose or suggest scanning a markup language document to locate a script portion, Applicants submit that claim 4, as well as claims 5-8, which depend from claim 4, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 10 stands rejected as unpatentable over Barrett. Claim 10, as amended, is directed to a method for modifying a markup language document that includes modifying at least one of

the function and property statements within the script portion of the document. The Examiner contends that Barrett discloses the recited modifying step on page 510, column 1, lines 22-45; page 512, column 1, lines 42-44; Figure 1; Figure 5B; and Table 1. Applicants disagree. The cited sections, and Barrett as a whole, fail to disclose or suggest function or property statements at all. Further, Barrett fails to disclose or suggest modifying function or property statements within the script portion of a markup language document. Applicants submit that claim 10, as well as claims 11-15, which depend from claim 10, are in condition for allowance for at least these reasons.

Additionally, dependent claim 11 also stands rejected as unpatentable over Barrett. Claim 11 is directed to a method for modifying at least one of the function and property statements within a script portion of a markup language document that includes scanning the markup language document to locate the script portion. Barrett does not disclose or suggest scanning a markup language document to locate the script portion. For at least the foregoing additional reason, claim 11, as well as claims 12-15, which depend from claim 11, are in condition for allowance.

Furthermore, dependent claim 13 also stands rejected as unpatentable over Barrett. Claim 13 is directed to a method for modifying a markup language document that includes replacing a predetermined function or property statement with a set or get cookies function call. Barrett does not disclose or suggest replacing a predetermined function or property statement with a set or get cookies function call. For at least the foregoing additional reason, claim 13 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 16 stands rejected as unpatentable over Barrett. Claim 16, as amended, is directed to a method for modifying an HTML document that includes locating hostnames of Universal Resource Locators (URLs) constructed or to be constructed within the script portion of the HTML document. Barrett does not disclose or suggest locating hostnames within the script portion of a particular HTML document.

The Examiner contends that Figure 3 and associated description; and Table 1 disclose the recited locating step of claim 16. Applicants disagree. Figure 3 illustrates the different building blocks used to perform intermediary functions. One of the building blocks is a request editor, which, as described in Table 1, can be used to redirect a request to a new URL. The request

editor receives a request for content. If the content is unavailable (*i.e.*, not cached), the request editor can change the URL of the request to point to a network location where the request information can be retrieved. Only the destination URL of a request is changed, not URLs within a document. Because Barrett does not describe or suggest locating and modifying hostnames of URLs contained within a script portion of an HTML document, Applicants submit that claim 16 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 17 stands rejected as unpatentable over Barrett. Claim 17, as amended, is directed to a method for modifying an HTML document that includes replacing a property and function statement within the script portion with a function call statement. Barrett does not disclose or suggest replacing a property or function statement in a script portion of an HTML document with a function call statement.

The Examiner contends that page 512, column 1, lines 17-30 and page 514, column 2, lines 26-48 disclose the recited element of claim 17. Applicants disagree. On page 512, column 1, lines 17-30, Barrett describes the WBI architecture and the function of WBI as a programmable proxy server. On page 514, column 2, lines 26-48, Barrett describes an implementation of the WBI infrastructure in both C++ and Java and describes a typical configuration as a client-side proxy. In neither cited section, nor in any other section of Barrett, is there any reference to or suggestion of property or functions statements within an HTML script or to function call statements. Barrett simply does not address the modification of an HTML script with a function call statement. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 17, as well as claims 18-19, which depend from claim 17, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 20 stands rejected as unpatentable over Barrett. Claim 20, as amended, is directed to a computer readable media including at least computer program code for modifying a markup language document and includes modifying the at least one link within a script portion to link to an intermediary server. For at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that claim 20, as well as claim 21, which depends from claim 20, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 21 stands rejected as unpatentable over Barrett. Claim 21, as amended, is directed to a computer readable media including at least computer program code for modifying a markup

language document and includes modifying at least one of the property and function statements within the script portion. For at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 10, Applicants submit that claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

New Claims


New claims 22-34 have been added. Claims 22-29 depend from claim 20 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth with respect to claim 20. Claims 30-34 depend from claim 21 and are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth with respect to claim 21.

Applicants respectfully request that all pending claims be allowed.

Applicants submit herewith a check in the amount of \$227.00 which includes the fee of \$117.00 for additional claims and \$110.00 for a one-month extension of time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 21 May, 2004



Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50208831.doc